



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/029,479	10/21/1998	SARA LAVI	2290.00061(T	6118

7590

03/27/2002

DR. D. Graeser LTD.  
C/O The Polkinghorns  
9003 Florin Way  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

EXAMINER

WOITACH, JOSEPH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

File

**Interview Summary**Application No.  
**09/029,479**Applicant(s)  
**Lavi, S.**Examiner  
**Joseph T. Voitach**Group Art Unit  
**1632**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph T. Voitach (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Dvirah Graeser (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 27, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: all pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

None/Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant contacted Examiner regarding a potential response after final to obviate the instant rejections of record. Upon review of the rejections of record and the present disclosure, Examiner noted that the evidence of record supported changes in PP2C activity, however the correlation was with respect to restoring a transformed phenotype and not a means to ameliorate cancer. Specifically, it was noted that the art and specification supported that an increase in PP2C activity was associated with the transformation process not a restoration of normal phenotype. It was unclear how this observation, a means to restore transformed activity, provides a nexus to the instantly claimed methodology drawn to restoring a normal phenotype.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

*Joe Voitach*  
 AU 1632

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.